



"Reffner, Julie M"
<julie.m.reffner@intel.com>
01/30/2007 08:01 AM

To <ckeck@co.el-dorado.ca.us>, <bostwo@el-dorado.ca.us>
cc "Jerry Reffner" <jreffner1@mac.com>, "Pam Fortune"
<steveandpam@starband.net>
bcc
Subject Just found this out

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
FEBRUARY 1, 2007
2007 JAN 30 AM 8:39

Brenda and Cindy,

Once again our rights as the adjacent property owners are being pushed aside. Fortunately for us, the Reffner's, we visited the Fortune's last night. During the conversation we found out that a packet was sent out which has our name on it but we never received it. We have scanned the documents and attached the first few pages in this email. I find it questionable how a document can be published with our names on it but we never received it and we are one of the two families requesting that the county reconsider the use of Silver Ridge Ct as the primary access for the proposed parcel split.

After further research we have identified that the county classifies Silver Ridge Ct as Private Rd - Right of Way for the purposes of taxes. How can a road be private in one standard for the county and then within the DOT, Planning, and Zoning there is not a clear standard or understanding of what an IOD is. I also find it amazing that we are required to pay the taxes and repairs on a road that is classified as private, but the county dictates to us that we have no rights as to who has access and must maintain the road accordingly with public traffic.

In addition, the county requires IOD's to be put in as part of parcel splits then why isn't there a clear and consistent standard on the interpretation of the law and the requirements the county is demanding on its tax paying citizens? An IOD requirement was put into a new parcel split project that was approved during the December 20th zoning committee meeting. The county continues to put in requirements without any type of consistent and documented standard in place.

Another comment, our rights, the county's lack of follow up and commitment to ensure all sides have equal rights are continuing to add to the perception of this county being a "Good Old Boy County." In several conversations with Mr. Wilkin he has made comments about his friends in the county - sure looks like his friends are in the right places and since we do not have the proper circle of friends our rights are pushed aside.

A couple more final thoughts:

-How can the planning dept recommend that our appeal is denied when county counsel has yet to make a determination?

-How can statements in the attached document be submitted when they are falsified - the bullet #7 was never discussed in the zoning committee although it was part of the concerns outlined in our document which was submitted. I walked out of the zoning committee kicking myself because I forgot to discuss this bullet. Listen to the tape to verify.

-The document also states in the paragraph under bullet seven that it was the opinion of the Reffner's that Silver Ridge CT is a private road

but the document neglected to mention that we have been told by numerous people within the county that IOD's are private until the county takes them over into the maintenance system. In addition Mr. Mauer stated that his interpretation of the Parcel Map does not give Mr. Wilkin access. This is why our IOD is going to County Counsel. Please look at the amended appeal document sent directly to Peter Mauer on the evening of January 8th. If this was not submitted as part of the appeal, I have a copy of the email sent to Mr. Mauer with the amendment per his direction.

- Another issue in the submitted appeal is the County's ownership on follow up of the requirements of the various projects that receive approval. The original split which included the IOD required street signs to be put in place - never completed and no accountability to be completed.

-The document submitted for the appeal meeting does not address all issues in the appeal - again only half and not all accurate information.

I suggest that the documentation that is submitted to the Board of Supervisors properly reflects accurate information and not just perceptions as well as further mistakes made by the County employees. Through out this entire process all we have requested is assistance to help us understand the laws and our rights. It has become very clear that the County lacks any type of consistent standard on an IOD to enable its citizens to better understand the law and how it applies to them. Its own employees do not even know what the county interpretation is so how can the citizens?

We will be covering this new issue with our lawyer to discuss our next steps. I do hope that this is also forwarded to Helen Bauman so that she has a truer picture of what is actually being requested. Since the Reffner's will not be able to attend the meeting on Feb 6, I want to ensure that the Supervisors have accurate information and not just what has been sent from the Planning Dept.

Julie Reffner



page4.jpg



page3.jpg



page2.jpg



page1.jpg